

REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated February 4, 2009. Claims 1, 4, 9-25, 30, 33, 36, 37 and 39 currently stand rejected. Independent claims 1 and 23 and claims 24, 25, 32, 33 and 37 have been amended for clarity. New claims 40 and 41 have been added to further define patentable aspects of the claimed invention. No new matter has been added by the amendment. Claims 4 and 39 have been canceled, without prejudice.

In light of the amendment and the remarks presented below, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all now-pending claims of the present application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

The Office Action has rejected claims 1, 4, 9-25, 30, 33, 36, 37 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Breck et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0210449, hereinafter “Breck” (referred to in the Office Action as “Breck”)) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0013788 to Pennell et al. (hereinafter “Pennell”). Claims 1, 4, 9-25, 30, 33, 36, 37 and 39 currently also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Laage et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0138445, hereinafter “Laage”) in view of Pennell. As indicated above, claims 4 and 39 have been canceled, and thus the rejections of claims 4 and 39 are now moot.

Independent claims 1 and 23 have been amended to further clarify that the identification code is one of a Subscriber Identity Module (SIM), a unique product code of the user equipment, or an internal mobile subscriber identity (IMSI) code. Thus, in accordance with an exemplary embodiment of the claimed invention, a verification is conducted with respect to whether automatic insertion of information into at least one of the claimed data fields of an information entity is allowed. Furthermore, the verification is conducted internal to a user equipment on the basis of an identification code that associates with the user equipment. Thus, the identification code used to verify whether automatic insertion of information is allowed is an identification code of a SIM, a unique product code of the user equipment or an IMSI code. Notably, none of these codes is a PIN code or some other code entered by the user.

The Office Action admits, and Applicants agree that Breck fails to provide any disclosure regarding verifying internally at the user equipment on the basis of an identification code that associates with the user equipment. To cure the admitted deficiency of Breck, the Office Action cites Pennell. In this regard, Pennell discloses a mechanism for automatically filling in user information into a form for various “scripted” sites that are identified by their respective URLs. Thus, whether or not Pennell discloses any internal verification, the verification is in any case not conducted with an identification code that is one of a Subscriber Identity Module (SIM), a unique product code of the user equipment, or an internal mobile subscriber identity (IMSI) code as provided in independent claims 1 and 23. Furthermore, even though Breck refers to a form of user authentication when the user swipes a smart card, the authentication is completed using a PIN code and not a Subscriber Identity Module (SIM), a unique product code of the user equipment, or an internal mobile subscriber identity (IMSI) code as provided in independent claims 1 and 23. Thus, Breck and Pennell, alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest internal verification with respect to whether automatic insertion of information into at least one of the claimed data fields of an information entity is allowed on the basis of an identification code that associates with the user equipment and is one of a Subscriber Identity Module (SIM), a unique product code of the user equipment, or an internal mobile subscriber identity (IMSI) code as provided in independent claims 1 and 23.

Laage is directed to a payment authorization mechanism in which the user, similar to Breck, enters a PIN number to authenticate a transaction (paragraph [0087]). Thus, Laage suffers from the same deficiency as Breck, and the combination of Laage and Pennell also suffers from the same deficiency as the combination of Breck and Pennell in relation to the fact that the PIN code is not a Subscriber Identity Module (SIM), a unique product code of the user equipment, or an internal mobile subscriber identity (IMSI) code as provided in independent claims 1 and 23. Thus, Laage and Pennell, alone or in combination also fails to teach or suggest internal verification with respect to whether automatic insertion of information into at least one of the claimed data fields of an information entity is allowed on the basis of identification code that associates with the user equipment and is one of a Subscriber Identity Module (SIM), a

unique product code of the user equipment, or an internal mobile subscriber identity (IMSI) code
as provided in independent claims 1 and 23.

Since, Breck, Laage and Pennell each fail to teach or suggest the above described features of independent claims 1 and 23, any combination of the cited references fails to render independent claims 1 and 23 obvious. Claims 9-25, 30, 33, 36 and 37 and new claims 40 and 41 depend either directly or indirectly from corresponding ones of independent claims 1 and 23, and thus include all the recitations of their corresponding independent claims. Therefore, dependent claims 9-25, 30, 33, 36, 37, 40 and 41 are patentable for at least the same reasons as given above for independent claims 1 and 23.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of claims 1, 9-25, 30, 33, 36 and 37 are overcome.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendment and remarks submitted above, it is respectfully submitted that the present claims are in condition for immediate allowance. It is therefore respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present invention.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Chad L. Thorson
Registration No. 55,675

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111

**ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON MAY 4, 2009.**
LEGAL02/3129588v1